

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Int rvi w Summary

Applicants are appreciative of the Examiner granting a personal interview with their legal representative, Jeffrey N. Cutler, on November 19, 2004. In the interview, the primary references (U.S. Patent No. 5,319,204 issued to Wong, U.S. Patent No. 3,919,556 issued to Berninger, and U.S. Patent No. 5,753,917 issued to Engdahl) were discussed relative to the claims as they currently stand.

As explained in the interview, and as further discussed below, Berninger and Wong are divergent in their technologies with respect to Anger. Applicants understand that Anger has not been cited, and as the Examiner stated, is old in the art. However, it must be looked at to determine the advancements made by others such as Berninger and Wong. When putting these references into perspective with Anger, it is clear to one skilled in the art that the improvements taught by each move away from Anger in opposite directions, with Berninger replacing the refractive fluid with a light guide having a convoluted surface as a result of the convexly-shaped photodetectors, whereas Wong eliminates the light guide altogether.

It was argued by the Examiner that the optical coupling disclosed by Wong was equivalent to a light guide, and therefore this argument of diverging technologies is moot. However, one skilled in the art would recognize a bonding agent used to establish optical coupling cannot serve the same purposes or functions as a light guide, and conversely, that a light guide cannot serve the same purposes or functions of an optical coupler. To wit, bonding agents have not, to Applicants' knowledge, been held out as being an equivalent to a light guide. More specifically, the bonding agent which establishes optical coupling serves only to remove any air gaps from between the two objects being optically coupled.

With respect to Engdahl, it was submitted that a collimator is not an equivalent to a pixelized crystal block. The combination of Engdahl with a reference such as Wong is without motivation. First, as in the above combination, Wong specifically teaches away from the use of a light guide. It is understood that the Examiner's position is that Wong does not specifically state that he was removing the light guide

Interview Summary OK
OG
01-17-05